
DESCRIPTIVE PRAGMATIC CONSTRUCTION

Khavaskhan Shokirova Nurmamatovna

Deputy Director, Doctor of Philological Sciences (DSc) of the National
Center for Teaching Educators of the Fergana Region to New Pedagogy

Abstract:	Keywords
This article will talk about the emergence of descriptive linguistics and the history of the origin of descriptivism, the development of linguistic pragmatics from the content of linguistic semantics.	linguistics, descriptivism, transformative grammar, distribution, ordering, phoneme, morpheme, sentence construction, distributive analysis, morphology, phonology phonomorphology, sistema, semantics, phonetics.

Introduction

Initially, the term descriptive linguistics appeared in the language. Descriptive linguistics (Eng.descriptive-pictorial," zapisannian " written) was introduced by American linguists in the 1920s-1950s. Founder L, who brought descriptivism to science Blumfieldis¹. The formation of this concept arose through the study of the language and culture of the American Indians. In the 1960s, the "basis of American Linguistics" was infiltrated by Transformational Grammar, a modified grammar.

Descriptive linguistics F.Boas, E.Sepir and L.Blumfield may refer to V.A.Zvegintsev argues that American structuralism is direct F.de not derived from the doctrine of Saussure. He arose at the time of the practical need in the process of learning the language of American induses.

Descriptive linguistics F.Boas, E.Sepir and L.Blumfield may refer to V.A.Zvegintsev argues that American structuralism is direct F.de not derived from the doctrine of Saussure. He arose at the time of the practical need in the process of learning the language of American induses. Descriptival linguistics has been ranked among the structural School of Europe, and the tradition of learning the native language of foreign immigrants of different groups living in the United States, the indean ethos L.Relying on Blumfield's ideas, no vocabulary, without a new method of analysis, without existing and not recorded grammars, arose under strict methods: (A) Analysis on the basis of comparative-historical linguistics; (B) analysis on the basis of phonetic changes.

¹ Амирова Т.А. Из истории лингвистики XX века. Структурно-функциональное языкознание (истоки, направления, школы). – М.: МГЛУ, 2000. – С.69-103., Блумфилд Л.Язык. – М.:Прогресс, 1968.-607с., Американская дескриптивная лингвистика. Научные исследования Л.Блумфилда. tapemark. narod. ru; sites.google.com.

=====

In the process of researching a language form unfamiliar to linguists, it was important to distinguish between linguistic unity, and a shaky criterion was established: in the name of the distribution, the unity in relation to speech was expressed. Distribution means compilation, distribution. The main units in the stages of language structure – phoneme, morpheme and sentence construction problems-were studied on the basis of distributive analysis:

1. The famous linguist and anthropologist F.Boas, while engaged in the study of the language of American indians, calls for abandoning the principles of verification common to all languages, instead focusing on the intrinsic nature of the concrete language being studied, learning by an inductive rather than deductive method². F.Boas, relying on his experience in learning the language of the American Indus, tried to justify the fact that the methods of research that came to the field based on the materials of Indo-European languages were absolutely impossible to apply to these languages. The language of the American Indus, firstly, has its own categories that differ from the Indo-European languages.

2. There are no written sources that testify to earlier periods of historical progress. Thirdly, it is still unknown which languages they are related to in the world. And these factors are F.Boas believes that the need arises for the development of objective verification techniques based on the external, formal aspect of the American Indus language. The result was a descriptive (descriptive) method. According to the promoters of this method, the main task of linguistics is to describe the language, that is, to explain the facts of the language, not to interpret, but to register. From this task, such a research method is known as descriptive (to describe – “description”). G about this method. Gleeson writes: "There is such an aspect of the language that little attention has been paid to it to this day. It is the internal structure of languages studied by descriptive linguistics, which is a separate scientific direction"³.

The Boas tradition was continued by Sepir and Blumfields⁴. Sepir focused more on issues such as the relationship of language to culture, the interaction of linguistic phenomena with social aspects, the typological classification of languages. His vision is his book "Language", "the state of linguistics as a science"⁵ featured in his article and other works. Sepir states that it is impossible to find a direct correspondence of culture with the construction of the language, that folk culture is associated with the dictionary sostavi of its language. His observations on language and Culture later served as the basis for the formation of a separate linguistic direction-ethnolinguistics, which studies the relationship

² Ф.Боас. История и наука в антропологии: ответ/Пер.Ю.С.Терентьева//Антология исследований культурк. – СПб.Ж.Университетская книга, 1997. – Т.1. – С.528-535.

³ Глисон Г.Введение в дескриптивную лингвистику. Пер.с англ.Изд.3 URSS,2008. – 496с.

⁴ Сепир Э. Язык. Введение в изучение речи. – М.-Л.: Соцэкгиз, 1934. – 222 с., Блумфилд Л. Язык. – М., 1968. – 606 с.

⁵ Сепир Э. Язык. Кўрсатилган манба.1934.– 222 с., Сепир Э. Избранные труды по языкознанию и культурологии. Под ред. А.Е.Кибрик. – М.: Прогресс; Университет, 1993. – 655с.

=====

of language with folk culture, customs. Sepir believes that a person to some extent lives in the domination of the language to which he belongs, the "real being" to some extent reflects his structure in the linguistic norms of the same society. As a result, he comes to the inhuman conclusion that what form of language leads to the division of objective being. The same idea was embodied in a hypothesis known as the "Sepir-Warf hypothesis". The reason why this hypothesis is referred to by the name of Sepir and WARF is that the above idea that Sepir outlined is B. It is also advanced by WARF. Sepir is critical of the typological classification of languages to their own⁶. In US linguistics, the problem of language structure is not posed, since Americans are mainly engaged in the study of speech activity; in descriptive linguistics, just like in generative grammar, language structure and system are not theoretical problems. In Applied Research, the concept of structure is placed in contrast to the concept of vocabulary and is perceived as a model that is logically formulated on the basis of text analysis⁷. In the early stages, the main goal was to describe the observed state of the language, while the identification or explanation of its causes was overlooked. The task of the researcher was to record and classify the elements of speech. Z.Z. Harris writes that "in the field of descriptivist linguistics, the practice of collecting and analyzing examples of some dialect is performed. Examples of collected colloquial units form the research material, while its analysis is limited to illuminating the arrangement of elements in a colloquial structure. The analyzed material is considered as a descriptive model of language"⁸. The description of the collected material, category and their relationship is given by means of symbols in descriptive linguistics. This makes it possible to illuminate the speech continuity. The structure of the linguistic descriptive model begins with the framework of speech. Unsatisfied with the results of descriptive analysis, the generativists also did not introduce any innovations to language structure analysis, as Transformational Grammar continues and complements descriptivism. The generative – creative model of language is based on descriptive ideas and serves to form speech structures. This model is interpreted as a pre-given, "innate" structure. The correctness of this idea is determined not by definition in relation to the object being described, but by the accuracy of its structure. Such an approach is perhaps correct, since the focus of the researcher is on the system being formed, and its application is ignored. In this way, it is inevitable that the method of analysis will lead to abstract conclusions⁹. In the method of analysis of descriptive linguistics, a characteristic isomorphism, that is, it covers phonological and morphonological principles into its composition, which, despite the differences in the types of learning, the main stage of learning is the same:

⁶ Нурмонов А. Танланган асарлар. 2-жилд. –Т.: Академнашр, 2012. – Б.118.

⁷ Chomskiy N. The Minimalist Program. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1995. – P.17-20.

⁸ Хэррис З.С. Метод в структурной лингвистике // В.А. Звегинцев. История языкознания XIX-XX веков в очерках и извлечениях, ч. II. –М., 1960. – С. 153-171; 1965. – С.209-227.

⁹ Бушуй Т., Сафаров Ш. Тил қурилиши: таҳлил методлари ва методологияси. –Т.: Фан, 2007.– Б.36.

Stage 1. Their attitude towards distributive structure and adjacent Language units and their variants (allophonic, allomorphemes), dividing the parts of a given text into segments (vowels, morphemes) ;

Stage 2. The composition of the distribution in the unit of the language structure and the conjugation of the distributive class in it;

Stage 3. The same structure of some language model at this structural level.

Descriptivists have confirmed the existence of a theoretical possibility: it is possible to build, organize the complete structure of a pictorial language through the same distribution and its form. Harris tried to accept the task of distribution as the very concept of the unity of language.

Descriptive linguistics is a special field of study, in which speech activity is not fully studied, but the main focus is on the individual characteristics of speech¹⁰. The main purpose of descriptive analysis is in the process of speech, to determine the rules for the interjection (distribution) or distribution of certain properties¹¹. Therefore, first of all, one has to think about the essence of both descriptive and non-descriptive words.

The calculation of indicative or descriptive words, which perform the function of calling, with denotative meaning, was emphasized above. While the meaning of indicative (denotative sense) words can be determined without context, the meaning of non-indicative words is only revealed within context, depending on the particular situation of speech. Therefore, the meaning of such words is inextricably linked with the context and the state of speech, that is, it will be conditioned¹². Non-descriptive words (Eng.descriptive-pictorial) such words do not directly name objects and phenomena in objective existence, but refer to them. Non-indicative words, similarly, do not have a naming property, acting as a hint.

Descriptive words express objects and phenomena in the objective universe with a clear denotative meaning. For this, the speech situation is not necessary. The same is true for indicative words. B, one of the major representatives of logical semantics. Russell divides words into indicative and non-indicative¹³. A particular thing in an objective being is the words indicative of words that have the property of naming events, character-traits, action-States, while words that do not have such a property are non-indicative words. In systematic-structural linguistics, words of the first type are referred to as descriptives, and words of the second type are referred to as non-descriptives.

Linguists dealing with sentence semantics have been much more challenged when such non-indicative, i.e. non-descriptive, words arrive in the sentence structure. The fact is that non-descriptive words cannot be identified in this way, even if the descriptive words

¹⁰ Звегинцев В.А. История языкознания XIX-XX веков в очерках и извлечениях,- ч. II. – М.: Учпедгиз, 1960. – 331 с.

¹¹ Бушуй Т.,Сафаров Ш. Кўрсатилган манба. – Б.154.

¹² Ҳақимов М.Ўзбек прагмалингвистикаси асослари. – Фарғона, 2013. – Б 16.

¹³ Рассел Б. Человеческое познание. – М., 1957, – с.139.

contained in a sentence do not connect with a specific speech situation, but have the opportunity to determine which denotative (referring) meaning they are, what they are naming in an objective being. Due to the fact that such words do not directly name things and phenomena, signs and characteristics, actions and circumstances in an objective being, it is clear that they remain unknown what they are referring to if they do not relate to a particular situation.

This showed that it is not possible to fully interpret the semantics of a sentence until you know how to determine the attitude of the words being used in the structure of that sentence only to objective existence. It was also necessary to add to this the determination of the attitude of the sentence to the speech process, to the speech situation. With such a practical need, linguistic pragmatics grew out of the bosom of linguistic semantics¹⁴. The object of descriptive analysis is a separate completed sentence in a particular language. And the sentence is a fragment of the speech of a certain person between two pauses. But it is argued that the sentence and the sentence are not equal to each other, that the sentence can be formed from both a word and a combination of words, and an unfinished sentence. Descriptors state that linguistic research will consist of collecting sentences in a given dialect and analyzing the collected material. The collected material, that is, the text, is divided into elements, and the distribution of these elements in relation to each other is determined. The class of linguistic elements is built on the basis of the experimental technique of substitution. And the laws of attachment of elements are restored on the basis of analysis on direct participants. Descriptors argue that segmentation, substitutionality, distributive analysis can be applied to the research of any aspect of a language. In contrast, separation-based analysis to indirect participants is only used within morphology and syntax. Descriptors who recognize language structure as a whole composed of the relation of expression and meaning, i.e. form and content, focus more on the study of units of formative structure¹⁵.

The transformation method was originally developed by one of the theorists of descriptive linguistics Z.S.Had been recommended by Hennis¹⁶. In his opinion:

1. The transformational analysis method helps to eliminate a number of the complexities encountered. Transformational analysis in many ways demonstrates the algebraic method of language structure analysis.
2. Z.S.The transformational method recommended by Hennis was his pupil N.Developed by khomsky¹⁷.

¹⁴ Хакимов М. Ўзбек прагмалингвистикаси асослари. – Фарғона, 2013. – Б.16.

¹⁵ Нурмонов А. Лингвистик таълимотлар тарихи. Танланган асар. II жилд. –Т.:Академнашр,2012. – Б.126.

¹⁶ Хэррис З.С. Метод в структурной лингвистике // В.А.Звегинцев. История языкознания XIX-XX веков в очерках и извлечениях, ч. II.-М., 1960.–С. 153-171; 1965.– С.209-227.

¹⁷ Chomsky N. The Minimalist Program. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1995. – P.17-20.

3. L.S.Barkhudarov considers generative linguistics, which also includes a transformational method, as the next step in linguistics after structural linguistics¹⁸.

4. He divides the history of linguistics into three grammatical theories according to which he works by relying on the three stages determined by the dialectical theory of knowledge of the universe: a) traditional, b) structural, v) generative (generating) linguistics. L.S.According to barkhudarov, the above three theories are based on three stages of cognition. Dialectical philosophy recognizes the stages of direct observation, analysis and synthesis of knowledge. Traditional linguistics relies on the first stage, the descriptive direction of structural linguistics on the second stage, and the glossematic and transformational method direction of structural linguistics on the synthesis stage.¹⁹

According to representatives of descriptive linguistics, the internal structure of a language consists of the relationship of three components: an expression plan (phonology, morphology, phonomorphology), a meaning plan and a dictionary. From these, the study of the meaning plan is considered inefficient compared to the study of the expression plan²⁰. Thanks to this, three central systems are distinguished: morphology, phonology and phonomorphology, and two border systems: semantics and phonetics. Hawzett believes that the study of the above two boundary systems is a task facing the future. The morpheme is viewed as a unit of not only the grammatical level, but also the lexical level.

N.A.Slyusareva F. a study of de Saussure's manuscripts concludes that F. de Saussure did not reject the word, its essence, in general. Only he, sensing the sath character of the word, sought to identify other units in its composition - morphemes and phonemes²¹.

H.Ne'matov stands in the position of descriptivists when evaluating a word. He will want to prove his opinion on the principles of systematic linguistics. In general, it is correct for him to follow in the footsteps of American linguists and distinguish phonemes, morphemes and constructions at the language level, since the principle of separation of linguistic units of American linguists is based on agglutinative languages. But the term constructionism used by American structuralists involves an extremely broad concept. Any whole consisting of a syntagmatic relation of two and more units is considered a construction, which means that the construction includes a sentence model, a vocabulary model, a word model. It should be noted that the descriptivists did not completely abandon the word term. The term "Word" (word) found in their works is equivalent to the morphological word in our understanding, that is, the word formed from a chain of certain morphemes²².

¹⁸ Бархударов Л.С. Язык и перевод.Изд.во ЛКИ. 2007.- <https://www.livelib.ru/book/1000324414-yazyk-i-perevod...>

¹⁹ Нурмонов А.Танланган асарлар. II жилд. – Т.:Академнашр, 2012. – Б.133.

²⁰ Глисон Г. Введение в дескриптивную лингвистику. – М., Пер.с англ.Изд.3 URSS, 2008.– С. 44.

²¹Слюсарева Н.А. Теория Ф.де Соссюра в свете современной лингвистики. – М., 1975. – С. 37-39.

²²Нурмонов А. Танланган асарлар.3-жилд.Т.: Академнашр, 2012.–Б.140. Арутюнова Н.Д., Климов Г.А., Кудрякова Е.С. Американский структурализм // Основные направления структурализма. – М., 1964. – С. 197-198.

=====

The connection of semiotics with science, the fact that pragmatics is a component of it, opens the way towards the goal that we follow this path of search. Pure semiotics includes pure syntax, pure semantics, pure pragmatics. In the form of a system, metathyl is produced, which is discussed using all marked situations. It is for this language pattern that the distinctly different manifestations described can be called descriptive semiotics (or responsive descriptive syntax, semantics, and pragmatics). And in this sense, the real “Encyclopedia” in what quantity it occupies an important place in the occurrence of descriptive semiotics, as it studies the field of language. Where the study of the structure of language science constitutes the competence of descriptive syntax, the study of the attitude of this language to a real existing situation covers descriptive semantics, the consideration of the relation of the originator, expression and user of the same language - descriptive pragmatic competence²³.

The main feature of non-descriptive elements is that the information they represent refers to the existence of an additional information representation in addition to the underlying proposition. Say, I, even, just like words that are not deictic descriptively counted. Here is how linguistic pragmatics deals with the analysis of contexts in which such words are involved²⁴.

Descriptors argue that segmentation, substitutionality, distributive analysis can be applied to the research of any aspect of a language. In contrast, separation-based analysis to indirect participants is only used within morphology and syntax. Descriptors who recognize language structure as a whole composed of the relation of expression and meaning, i.e. form and content, focus more on the study of units of formative structure. G.Gleason stated that the study of the substantive system of language was done some time slowly compared to the study of the formative system, and little result was achieved. To this day, the study of the content structure cannot be considered established on a scientific basis. The descriptors' error in studying the language expression side is that they did not understand the connection between the content structure and the form structure, and did not consider the content structure when studying the form structure. Unfortunately, the content structure can only be approached through the formative structure. In contrast to the content structure, the form structure is given directly to our sensory organs and can be easily studied. Therefore, a high level of sound study accuracy has been achieved in acoustic and articulatory phonetics:

1. G.As Gleason decomposes the expression plan into parts, it shows phonemes and morphemes as its main elements. In his opinion, the phoneme is considered the minimum unit of the language expression system that serves to distinguish one sentence from the other²⁵.

²³ Степанов Ю.С. Семиотика. М., Радуга, 1983. - С. 44.

²⁴ Хакимов М. Ўзбек прагмалингвистикаси асослари. Фарғона нашриёти, 2013. - Б. 21.

²⁵ Глисон Г. Введение в дескриптивную лингвистику. Пер. с англ. Изд. 3 URSS, 2008. - 496 с.

2. The morpheme is the second major unit of the expression system. Its definition is much more complex, that is, it is a unit of the system of expression of the language, which is used in connection with the content system of the language.

3. The first stage of distributive analysis begins with the division of the sentence into the smallest parts – segmentation and their expression with symbols in a notebook. For example, we can freely divide the book-reading compound into the following segments: ki-tob-ni o'-qi-moq.

The researcher will ask the pronouncer to repeat the pronunciation of this compound, or the same compound will be pronounced through another informant. When pronounced the second time, the sounds in the sentence can be slightly different from the previous one, for example, o can be pronounced longer in one and shorter in the other. But informants perceive the sounds pronounced in both cases as the same. Because the elongated-short pronunciation of o will not be important for informants, the meaning does not differ. Then we put the separated segments in this sentence in another sentence and check if this can be done for the informant. On this basis, we determine that each sound is a representative of one or another segment. Using one vowel in different positions, their encirclement is determined. The envelope of an element is the neighborhood of elements defined by the way above. Under the term "element adjacency" is understood the position that one element occupies in relation to another. The segment that is surrounded by the same can be pronounced differently by different informants and not affect the meaning. In this case, they are considered different representatives of one segment. But if the meaning changes, they cannot be called different representatives of one segment. For example, when we substitute n for the first segment of tok, a completely new meaningful nok follows. So, t and n are considered representatives of other-other segments. As a result of segmentation of sentences, pronounced backgrounds are distinguished in hundreds of views. Phonemes are identified by combining these segments into a relatively limited number of classes. To combine segments into such groups – classes, a distribution of elements (layout order) serves. Under the term element distribution, the sum of all the envelopes of these elements is understood²⁶.

Cemantika is a sign of an object, in relation to its designati, which expresses or expresses its denotation. Just like other laws in semantics, characters are distinguished between pure semantics and descriptive semantics. Pure semantics offers adjectives and pronouns, it is necessary to take into account the semantic changes of Semiosis. Descriptive semantics, on the other hand, studies the occurrence of the true reality of these real changes. Philosophical language researchers have tried to find from nature the participation of the linguistic structure and differentiation of speech units. Representatives of philosophical empiricism studied the sign and its denotation in general terms. There has always been a debate over the term truth: about the attitude of the sign to something, to the subject. But despite so

²⁶ Нурмонов А. Танланган асар. 2-ж. Кўрсатилган манба. Ўша бет.

much discussion, this issue has not yet been fully revealed in the semantic transformations of Semiosis²⁷.

The concepts of many words are focused on pragmatic factors that are not clearly formed or hidden to the end, that is, expressed according to the condition of the speech act. Through the condition of the speech act, we understand the deep meaning of the word. The speech Act gives rise to the participants, that is, the speaker and the listener, and their place, time, Speech Act²⁸.

The connection between the concepts of words and the speech act is formed in different ways. This can be said to be the effect of a speech act on the concept of a word. Lexical concepts as a result of the influence of verbal meanings on the speech act, pragmatic operations are performed. Here are such effects that manifest in themselves the index signs of the language. The concept of such words: I, you, we, now, today are such words as.

References

1. Амирова Т.А. Из истории лингвистики XX века. Структурно-функциональное языкознание (истоки, направления, школы). – М.: МГЛУ, 2000. – С.69-103.
2. Блумфилд Л.Язык. – М.:Прогресс, 1968.-607с., Американская дескриптивная лингвистика. Научные исследования Л.Блумфилда. tapemark. narod. ru; sites.google.com.
3. Глисон Г.Введение в дескриптивную лингвистику.Пер.с англ.Изд.3 URSS, 2008.-496с.
4. Степанов Ю.С.Семиотика.М., Радуга,1983.-С.44.
5. Ҳақимов М. Ўзбек прагмалингвистикаси асослари. – Фарғона нашриёти, 2013. – Б.21.
6. Нурмонов А.Танланган асарлар. 2-жилд. –Т.:Академнашр, 2012. – Б.118.
7. Chomckiy N. The Minimalist Program. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1995. – P.17-20.
8. Хэррис З.С. Метод в структурной лингвистике // В.А.Звегинцев. История языкознания XIX-XX веков в очерках и извлечениях, ч. II. –М., 1960. – С. 153-171; 1965. – С.209-227.

²⁷ Степанов Ю. Семиотика. Кўрсатилган манба. – С.54.

²⁸ Сусов И.П. Лингвистическая прагматика.Кўрсатилган манба.-С.23.